R5685-4

Volume 13, No. 8 August, 1985

South Africa: On the Road to Revolution?

FOCUS

The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Twenty Years Later

A distinguished civil rights lawyer cites political gains for blacks but stresses need for continued vigilance.

"We Can Work Together"

Senate majority leader Dole asks blacks to give G.O.P. a closer look.

ISSN 0740-0195

Joint Center for Political Studies

Perspective

by Eddie N. Williams, President, Joint Center

Deciding which political party to join or which candidate to support is a highly personal matter. Decisions are often influenced by tradition, emotions, and ideology, not to mention enlightened self-interest. Facts and figures, standing alone, can seldom provide a clear road map to a decision.

Given this complex array of factors influencing partisanship, one would expect to see substantial segments of the electorate, as well as various subgroups, shift support from time to time between parties and between competing candidates. Generally, this has been done, although demonstrably more Democrats than Republicans are always elected to office. One conspicuous exception has been the behavior of the black electorate, which has voted consistently and overwhelmingly for Democratic candidates, at least during the past two decades.

This trend among blacks has been the subject of much debate. Does it weaken political influence by leading Republicans to ignore blacks and Democrats to take them for granted? Should blacks divide their support more evenly between Democrats and Republicans and, if so, by what magic formula? Should blacks vote their conscience, regardless of the prospects for electoral success, or should they be opportunists, always seeking to be on the winning side? And, finally, which should come first, black support for a political party or a party's support for black interests?

This subject is enormously complicated, and so far no one has found the right prescription for changing black voting patterns. Looming on the horizon, however, are several developments that could begin to shape the way blacks and Republicans view each other. The most obvious one, of course, is the growing dissension in Democratic ranks over whether the party should become more conservative in pursuit of southern white votes or stand pat on its traditional platform with a strong civil rights plank. Blacks, who provide 20 percent of all Democratic votes in presidential elections, are not likely to stand idly by while the party yanks their favorite platform planks out from under them. The big question, though, is whether the Republican Party will be seen as an attractive alternative.

Two other developments suggest that the foundation is being laid for some serious dialogue between blacks and the GOP. One is the apparent increase in Republican support, at least in Congress and at the state and local levels, on some issues of special concern to blacks, accompanied by the conspicuous overtures some Republicans are now making for black support. The other is an increase in the number of Republican role models in the black community.

One reason that blacks generally have not supported Republican candidates is the widespread perception among blacks that Republicans do not share an appreciable number of their dearest concerns. Republicans are trying to change this perception. The Republican National Committee has been quietly recruiting black voters and candidates. Two Republican senators, Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania and Charles Mathias of Maryland, provided the crucial votes to kill President Reagan's nomination of Brad Reynolds to be deputy attorney general. And the Republican-controlled Senate voted overwhelmingly for sanctions against South Africa.

Several other Republican overtures have been conspicuous for their boldness. Senate majority leader Robert Dole's recent appeal for black support, for example, stands in stark contrast to President Reagan's five-year-long spree of black leader-bashing. In a speech reprinted in this issue of *Focus*, Senator Dole said, "I believe that over the next several years [Republicans] can move more quickly toward majority status if inroads are made into the black vote. If we do, that would mean long-term political clout for black Americans."

Last month, some encouraging words also came from Secretary of Labor William Brock, when he embraced affirmative action far more strongly than has any other top Reagan appointee. Brock also encouraged stronger ties between his party and blacks during his tenure (1977-1981) as chairman of the Republican National Committee.

(Continued on page 8)

FOCUS

Copyright © 1985 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc. The monthly newsletter of the ***Joint Center for Political Studies,*** *1301 Pa. Ave. N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed FOCUS articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. FOCUS is published monthly. $12.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.*

president: Eddie N. Williams
vice president: Eleanor Farrar
director of communications: J. Terry Edmonds
director of development: Kathleen Vander Horst
director of finance: Brenda Watkins Noel
director of information resources: Auriel Pilgrim
director of marketing: Cari Cook
director of research: Milton Morris
manager of administrative services: Patricia Roberson
senior editor: Jane E. Lewin
editorial assistant: Constance B. Toliver

Board of Governors

Wendell Freeland, Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
William B. Boyd, Johnson Foundation, *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin, Howard University, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams, Congress of National Black Churches
Robert McCormick Adams, Smithsonian Institution
Lucius Jefferson Barker, Washington University
Hortense Williams Dixon
Mervyn Dymally, U.S. House of Representatives
Marian Wright Edelman, Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster, Moton Memorial Institute
Jayne Brumley Ikard
Robert C. Maynard, *Oakland Tribune*
Bernard Rapoport, American Income Life Insurance Co.
Eddie N. Williams, Joint Center for Political Studies
James D. Wolfensohn, James D. Wolfensohn, Inc.

Eleanor Farrar, Joint Center for Political Studies, *Secretary to the Board*

"We Can Work Together"

by Robert Dole

(The author is majority leader of the U.S. Senate. He delivered these remarks in a speech to the National Urban League on July 22, 1985, in Washington, D.C.)

It is a pleasure to address the National Urban League. Several weeks ago I asked Vernon Jordan if he would help assemble a small group of black leaders to meet with me and other Republican senators. He did—so on last Wednesday we met with Vernon, John Jacob, Ben Hooks, Eddie Williams, Julius Chambers, and Joe Lowery. For about two hours we talked about a number of things—politics, Republicans, Democrats, national and international issues. Most importantly, we talked about how we can work together.

A New Relationship

Because of that meeting, I have a new hope. It is a hope that we can develop a true understanding of one another after a long period of confused perceptions. It is a hope that will mature into understanding where we can set aside those things that divide us and join together in areas that unite us.

I've been told by your leaders that the one big obstacle to a new relationship is the perception by many that the Republican party has turned its back on the principles for which its patron saint, Lincoln, fought. I've been told by Republicans that the one massive obstacle for a better relationship is the widespread perception and some reality that black America has forever turned its back on our party.

I can do little to dispel this perception without help from black Americans and their leadership, and only you can say whether your hearts and minds are truly open. But perhaps I can do a little something to change your perceptions, by demonstrating that the light of conscience has not gone out in my party. If you believe we are a monolithic group, insensitive to the needs of the disadvantaged and poor, in my view you are wrong.

When I was a county attorney of Russell, Kansas, one of my responsibilities was monthly approval of welfare claims and checks. Two of the welfare checks were made out to my grandparents. Partly because of this, I'm more than a little sensitized to people who struggle all their lives but cannot make ends meet.

That's why I try to understand issues like food stamps, and voting rights, and issues affecting the poor, the handicapped and other vulnerable groups. That's why I believe that budget deficits cannot be reduced simply by slashing programs affecting low-income Americans. This does not mean, however, that any program should be exempt from fiscal scrutiny.

A Compassionate Party

If you believe Republicans live only in white suburbs and spurn integration, then tell me why [Senator Charles] Mac Mathias [of Maryland] has devoted so many years to putting real teeth into the 1968 Fair Housing Act. Why is he working with Sam Pierce [Secretary of Housing and Urban Development] right now to come up with a bill that can be enacted into law this Congress? *He cares.*

If you believe Republicans dislike affirmative action, then why has Senator Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania been one of the few in either party to speak out forcefully on this troublesome issue? *He cares.*

If you believe Republicans are selective in their support for civil rights, why has Senator Mack Mattingly of Georgia been with you on every major civil rights issue? Why does he work closely with the Martin Luther King Center? *He cares.*

If you believe Republicans are callous and insensitive toward the needs of children in poverty, why has Senator Paula Hawkins of Florida led the charge for federal programs to protect such children from crime, drugs, disease, and malnutrition?

If you believe Republicans ignore the problems of our inner cities, why does Senator Alfonse D'Amato of New York put urban crime, mass transit, and illegal drug peddling at the top of his legislative agenda?

If you believe Republicans aren't concerned about black teenage joblessness, why has Senator Dan Quayle of Indiana made it a top priority of his employment subcommittee? *They all care.*

Republicans understand that there are those who must look to the federal government for help in opening the door of opportunity. But we also believe that compassionate governments don't impose double-digit inflation on the poor and give them welfare checks instead of jobs in a healthy private sector. We believe that a rising tide lifts all boats, but we also understand, as Vernon Jordan once said, that some boats are still in the "drydocks of America's economy" and will remain stranded without the government's help.

Republicans don't often quote Franklin D. Roosevelt, but FDR said something in his second inaugural address that sums up what I think the vast majority of Americans believe. "The test of our progress," he said, "is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have too much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

Ending the Standoff

I cannot guarantee that every Republican subscribes to this view, any more than you can be confident that all Democrats do. But let me add this. If you don't like what you see in the Republican Party (and not many groups are perfect), the best way to bring about change is to join the internal debates.

The political reality is that the Republican Party is moving toward majority status, even as the Democrats maintain a strangle-hold on the black vote. So now some experts say, "Why bother? The Republican Party doesn't need the black vote anyway, and besides, they're tied permanently to the Democratic Party." Now I don't subscribe to this theory, as I believe that over the next several years we can move

(Continued on page 5)

The Voting Rights Act: Twenty Years Later

by Frank R. Parker

(The author was recently selected as the Joint Center's first Distinguished Scholar. In 1965, when the Voting Rights Act was passed, he was a summer law clerk in the Justice Department. Since 1968, he has written on voting rights issues and has litigated a number of voting rights cases.)

On August 6, 1965—20 years ago this month—President Lyndon B. Johnson traveled up Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol to sign into law the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Speaking in the same room in which President Lincoln signed the bill freeing those slaves who had been impressed into the Confederate armed forces, President Johnson said, "This act flows from a clear and simple wrong. Millions of Americans are denied the right to vote because of their color. This law will ensure them the right to vote."

Calling the act "a victory for Negro leadership," the president pointed out that it also constituted "a great challenge to that leadership" to register the unregistered. And to those who were bemoaning the act as a "crumbling" of "the old ways," he offered, "It is right that it should come and when it has, you will find a burden that has been lifted from your shoulders, too.... Men cannot live with a lie and not be stained by it."

In *Black Ballots*, Steven F. Lawson showed that the passage of the Voting Rights Act was the culmination of a 21-year struggle begun in 1944 when the Supreme Court held the "white primary" to be unconstitutional (*Smith* v. *Allwright*). More immediately, the act was one of the greatest successes of the civil rights movement of the early 1960s. After civil rights workers were murdered for trying to organize voter registration drives in the South and Alabama state troopers in Selma drove demonstrators back with whips and billy clubs, President Johnson instructed his attorney general, Nicholas Katzenbach, "to write the goddamndest toughest voting rights act that you can devise."

Unprecedented in Scope

Previous voting rights laws (those enacted in 1957 and 1960) had turned out to be ineffective. Although a number of cases had been filed under them, the increase in black voter registration was very slight. Remedies were needed that did not depend upon case-by-case implementation by southern judges.

The act that a bipartisan coalition in Congress finally produced was unprecedented in scope. Section 4 automatically outlaws the use of literacy tests and other discriminatory voter registration qualifications in any covered state or locality (a jurisdiction where voter registration or turnout has been below 50 percent of all eligible adults). Section 5 automatically suspends the enforcement of any new voting laws or procedures in a covered state and locality until that state or locality has satisfied either the U.S. Attorney General or the U.S. district court in Washington, D.C., that the new law is not discriminatory in purpose or effect. Section 6 authorizes the attorney general to dispatch federal examiners (registrars) to covered areas to register qualified citizens to vote; and Section 8 allows the attorney general to send in federal observers (poll watchers) to monitor elections to ensure that registered voters are able to vote.

A New Era of Black Political Participation

The Voting Rights Act ushered in a new era of black political activism in the country at large and in the South in particular. Before the act was passed, only 41 percent of all eligible blacks in the South were registered to vote (in contrast to 65 percent of eligible whites). And in Mississippi, where the full panoply of discriminatory techniques as well as intimidation and violence had been used, the black voter registration rate was 6.7 percent of the black voting-age population—the lowest rate in the nation. But after passage, the rate of black registration in the South jumped 21 percent—an increase of better than 50 percent in the number of southern blacks registered.

Today, the Census Bureau's 1984 statistics show that 65.6 percent of blacks eligible to vote in the South are registered, equaling 6.5 million registered voters.

The new era of black political participation has also seen a striking increase nationwide in the number of blacks elected to public office. In 1964, the year before passage of the Voting Rights Act, probably no more than 300 blacks held elective office in the United States. As of January 1985, the Joint Center tallied 6,056 black elected officials (see *Focus*, May 1985)—63 percent of whom are in the South.

Three Extensions

The original authors of the Voting Rights Act were convinced that racism in the electoral process could be removed by temporary remedies. Thus, provisions such as the banning of voter registration tests (Section 4) and the requiring of advance approval for changes in voting laws (Section 5) were to be in effect for only five years. But in 1969, after an 18-month study of how the 1965 Act was being implemented, the staff director of the United States Commission on Civil Rights reported to Congress:

> The history of white domination in the South has been one of adaptiveness, and the passage of the Voting Rights Act, and the increased black registration that followed, have resulted in new methods to maintain white control of the political process.
>
> For example, state legislature and political party committees in Alabama and Mississippi have adopted rules since the passage of the Act which have had the purpose or effect of diluting the votes of newly enfranchised Negro voters. These measures have taken the form of switching to at-large elections where Negro voting strength is concentrated in particular election districts, facilitating the consolidation

of predominantly Negro and predominantly white counties, and redrawing the lines of districts to divide concentrations of Negro voting strength.

Consequently, the act's "temporary" provisions were extended and amended by Congress three times—in 1970, 1975, and 1982. The "temporary" ban on discriminatory voter registration tests and devices was made permanent. And, although the special provisions of the act originally covered only 7 states (Alabama, Alaska, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia), 26 counties in North Carolina, and 1 county in Arizona, today they cover 9 states (Texas and Arizona were added) and parts of 13 others (including large portions of California and the boroughs of Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx in New York City).

The special protections of the act have also been amended to include language-minority groups (such as Spanish-speaking citizens and Native Americans). The language-minority provisions require that voter registration and election officials in designated areas provide bilingual voter registration and voting assistance to persons not fluent in English.

Unfinished Business

Despite the dramatic successes of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, what Jesse Jackson has called "the unfinished business of the Voting Rights Act" still remains. Black citizens have not yet achieved parity with whites in political participation. Blacks constitute 10.5 percent of the total voting-age population nationwide but hold only 1.2 percent of the elective offices, and that 1.2 percent tends to be concentrated in districts where the electoral majority is black.

Recent court decisions across the country, including the recent North Carolina legislative reapportionment decision and the Louisiana congressional redistricting case, show that in many areas black citizens continue to be denied an equal opportunity to participate in the electoral process. Measures used to limit the political effectiveness of blacks include discriminatory at-large voting, racial gerrymandering of district lines, and such barriers to voter registration as dual registration requirements and prohibitions on satellite registration.

Discriminatory measures adopted after November 1964 can be caught by the federal preclearance requirement of Section 5 of the act—unless they are implemented in states not covered by Section 5 or were adopted before Section 5 went into effect. And even within the covered states, if the attorney general fails to object to a discriminatory change in voting requirements, no appeal is possible and litigation is necessary.

Voting rights litigation suffered a severe setback in 1980 when the Supreme Court, in *City of Mobile* v. *Bolden,* construed Section 2 of the act (which prohibits racial discrimination in voting throughout the country) as requiring proof of discriminatory intent. Two years later, however, over the opposition of the Reagan administration, Congress amended Section 2, replacing the need to prove discriminatory intent with a more liberal "results" test.

But the Supreme Court has not yet issued a definitive interpretation of this new Section 2 "results" test. Some decisions in lower federal courts have unduly restricted the use of this results-based standard (see *Focus,* June 1985), and the Justice Department has recently filed briefs in the Supreme Court urging a very limited interpretation of the new Section 2.

For minority citizens, then, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 opened doors to electoral participation that had been shut for more than three-quarters of a century, but 20 years after passage of the act, efforts are still under way to limit the political participation of minority citizens. Thus, simply gaining the ballot is not enough. Only continued vigilance and vigorous enforcement can ensure minority voters the right to effective participation in our democratic process.

". . . Work Together"

(Continued from page 3)

more quickly toward majority status if inroads are made into the black vote. If we do, that would mean long-term political clout for black Americans and a strong effective voice in their government.

I can assure you that very few Republicans take pride in the lack of party support among black voters. We do want to reach out, to be responsive—but it must be a two-way street. If you give us an opportunity, we will demonstrate, as we are doing now, that being a Republican can bring positive results for the future. And finally, as Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole—a person I deeply respect—said two years ago in addressing this convention,

> If we have differences of opinion—and no two humans are ever completely immune to such expressions of their own individuality—then let us at least acknowledge the harmony of our basic objectives. And then let us go on from there, to narrow the differences and expand the common ground on which we march toward better days. □

The National Urban League is holding its 29th Annual Equal Opportunity Day Dinner on November 21, 1985, at the New York Hilton Hotel. The League annually presents its Equal Opportunity Award to leading citizens. For more information contact the League at 500 East 62nd St., New York, NY 10021; telephone (212) 310-9000.

S. Africa: On the Road to Revolution?

by Bernard Johns

(Mr. Johns is a senior fellow at the Joint Center, on detail from the U.S. Department of State under its Pearson Fellowship Program.)

Do the acute political tension and the violence associated with it in South Africa today signal the imminence of revolutionary change? Or are they merely "normal" characteristics of rule under a totalitarian regime, where violence periodically flares up but brings little change to those who are oppressed?

Many Western observers of South African politics believe that a violent revolution against the regime is unlikely. In their eyes, black South Africans have neither the determination nor the capability necessary for conducting such a revolution. Indeed, despite popular revolts in Iran, Lebanon, and Afghanistan, the current assumption is that a politically passive, illiterate, and impoverished people is unlikely to be successful in translating personal grievances into organized political demands and is easily co-opted or coerced into submission by an efficient authoritarian regime. Extending that assumption to South Africa, those same Western observers anticipate a prolonged period of political stability, despite the current unrest, during which the apartheid regime will undertake fundamental reforms that will eventually give full political equality to black South Africans.

The pattern of black-white relations in South Africa in this century, however, makes such reasoning seem suspect. In 1906, blacks had sufficient access to modern weaponry to match and momentarily defeat white military power during the Zulu anti-poll-tax revolt. Between 1906 and 1949, when South Africa's gun control laws became the strictest in the world, blacks channeled their protests against the country's *de facto* segregation into moral appeals to the ruling whites' Christian conscience and legal appeals to the governmental institutions capable of redressing their grievances. During that 43-year period, blacks accepted the legitimacy of the white ruling authority; and the political parties of protest that emerged—the Natal Indian Congress, the Independent and Commercial Workers' Union, the Communist Party, the Youth League of the African National Congress—all worked for constructive change from within the system.

Nonviolent Protest

But after 1948, the failure of efforts to remove racial segregation—indeed, the ruling Afrikaners' systematic institutionalization of apartheid—radicalized the majority of black leaders. Instead of continuing to express their protests by legal means, they turned to illegal (but still nonviolent) means.

The willingness of blacks in large numbers to oppose apartheid by illegal means was perhaps the most significant warning until then that a revolutionary process had begun. The political stability of any regime depends, among other things, on the regime's being accepted by the populace as legal—and after 1948, black South Africans began to challenge the legality of white rule in their country and openly defied the government's authority. Many Western observers, however, appear to have ignored the passing of that threshold. To them, black defiance of the regime was, and has continued to be, nothing more than the political unrest normally associated with authoritarian regimes everywhere—in their eyes, little different from ordinary hooliganism.

Armed Struggle

In 1960, the police fired into a crowd of demonstrators at Sharpeville, killing 67 and wounding 186. A 16-month state of emergency followed, during which 700 blacks were killed and 5,000 were wounded, according to South African authorities. That incident, although relatively prolonged, struck many Western observers as isolated, and to them the end of the state of emergency meant the return of "normality." Actually, however, after Sharpeville, black resistance changed: it became organized and armed. A guerrilla underground was trained abroad; terrorists organized and became active, expressing in their fanaticism and violence a sense of black nationalism that transcended ethnic identities and ethnic fragmentation. Even some whites—student members of the Youth Wing of the South African Liberal Party—briefly engaged in sabotage in the early 1960s.

Between 1964 and 1976 the regime effectively suppressed organized armed resistance, allowing many Western observers to continue believing that political turmoil in South Africa was a routine matter and not yet a threat to South Africa's security. But in fact, during those years black leadership capabilities and popular opposition to apartheid were growing.

So in 1976, when the police shot student demonstrators in Soweto, a period of violence began that has not yet ended. Not only do large numbers of youths demonstrate disregard for and defiance of police authorities, but hundreds of them have fled to foreign countries in search of guerrilla training.

To date, neither the guerrilla nor the political activity of blacks has achieved very much progress toward toppling the apartheid regime. Western observers attribute those failures to lack of a broad-based black revolutionary consciousness, to tribal and ethnic factionalism, and (so far as the guerrillas are concerned) to lack of a ruthless revolutionary mentality and inadequate training in guerrilla warfare and underground leadership.

These shortcomings, however, should be viewed as temporary, since increasing numbers of black South Africans now receive training in the Soviet Union, China, Cuba, and North Korea; and acts of urban terrorism originating in countries neighboring on South Africa are increasing (as are the South African government's military counter-raids into those countries). One should not, therefore, automatically assume the dominance of white military forces during the long term. For, as the United States learned in Vietnam, quantitative strength does not neatly translate into qualitative strength, and numbers of casualties or body counts cannot be equated with a combatant's will to fight and his ability to sustain losses for a considerable period of time to obtain a political goal.

(Continued on page 8)

Telescope

JCPS Appoints New Senior Military Fellow

Colonel William S. King, U.S. Air Force, has been appointed a senior military fellow at the Joint Center. He will be in residence at the center for one year conducting research on military manpower and personnel issues and participating in other Joint Center activities.

Colonel King has been in the Air Force for 29 years. His most recent position was chief of personnel at Bolling Air Force Base. He received his master's degree in education from St. Mary's University, San Antonio, Texas, and his doctorate, also in education, from George Washington University in Washington, D.C.

King is succeeding Colonel James R. Daugherty of the U.S. Army, who completed his fellowship with the Joint Center earlier this summer.

JCPS Gets New Director of Communications

J. Terry Edmonds joined the Joint Center's staff as director of the Office of Communications (formerly the Office of Publications) in July. Edmonds will direct the public affairs and publishing programs of the center. Previously, he was director of public relations at Trahan, Burden & Charles, Inc., an advertising and public relations agency in Baltimore. He has also worked on the communications staffs of the Maryland Mass Transit Administration, Carling National Breweries, the Maryland Academy of Sciences, and United Way of Central Maryland.

1985 Roster of BEOs Now Available

The Joint Center's *Black Elected Officials, A National Roster, 1985* is now available from UNIPUB.

This important reference book costs $29.50 and can be ordered from UNIPUB by calling toll-free **800 521-8110** (in Michigan, call 313 761-4700). Specify order number **5064-JCP-202.** Or write UNIPUB, P.O. Box 1222, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

ATTENTION: BLACK ELECTED OFFICIALS
SPECIAL OFFER

Black officials listed in the *Roster* will receive a 20 percent discount—$6.00 off the full price—if they order by September 30, 1985. Call or write, using the phone number or address shown above, but *be sure to use special order number* **506S-JCP-202.**

Black Unemployment Rate Drops 1.6 Percent

The unemployment rate for blacks decreased from 15.6 percent in May to 14.0 percent in June, an unusually large decline. The rate fell 1.4 percentage points each for black men and black women. The rate for black youth declined slightly, from 40.4 percent in May to 38.1 percent in June. And the number of discouraged workers—those who want to work but are not looking for jobs because they feel they cannot find them—edged down to 1.1 million, the lowest level in four years.

Janet L. Norwood, commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, cautioned, however, that "the jobless rate for blacks tends to be quite volatile, and we cannot determine if this decline represents a real improvement with only a single month of data."

Unemployment Rates, May and June 1985

	May	June
All blacks	15.6%	14.0%
Black men	13.6	12.2
Black women	13.7	12.3
Black youth	40.4	38.1
All workers	7.2	7.2

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Conference on Black Children

The National Black Child Development Institute, a nonprofit organization concerned with the welfare of black children, is holding its fifteenth annual conference October 16-18, 1985, in Washington, D.C. Leaders in the field of child development will conduct seminars and workshops around the conference theme—"Vision for Black Children: A Commitment for Change." From 500 to 800 people are expected to participate in more than 40 sessions to be held on child care, education, health, and research.

For more information contact Vicki Pinkston, conference coordinator, National Black Child Development Institute, 1463 Rhode Island Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005; telephone (202) 387-1281.

Cover photo, bottom right, courtesy of The National Coalition on Black Voter Participation, Inc.

Perspective

(Continued from page 2)

Looking down the road, it is of some significance that all four of the anticipated Republican presidential contenders (Dole, Howard Baker, Representative Jack Kemp, and Vice President George Bush) have far more credibility and generate far more empathy in the black community than does President Reagan. Such rapport may come in handy as Republicans seek to retain control of the Senate in 1986 and of the White House in 1988.

The near-absence of Republican role models in the black community until recently has been another major impediment for the party. Although few influential black political leaders are Republicans, this picture is beginning to change. Evidence may be seen in the conversions of a number of state and local black leaders to the GOP and in the appointment of blacks to highly visible positions.

The conversion of Wayne County (Michigan) Executive William Lucas to the Republican Party got national media coverage and a White House celebration. Other conversions have yet to make national headlines but are nonetheless significant. In May, for example, 23 black Democrats switched their registration in Fort Worth, Texas. Among them were the president of the Minority Leaders and Citizens Council and a former state legislator who had once served on the school board. In North Carolina, a black businessman who serves on the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission also switched to the GOP. Recently, the first black ever elected to anything in Somerset County, Maryland, won a seat on the Republican State Central Committee with strong white support. A black attorney is the deputy governor of Illinois and thus a senior counselor to Republican Governor James Thompson. And on Capitol Hill, the Republican-controlled Senate has appointed Trudi Morris to be the first black deputy sergeant at arms.

These may all be isolated developments prompted in large measure by political expediency. But the fact remains that similar political conversions and appointments are cropping up in various parts of the country. If they continue, the Republicans will soon have a sizable cadre of indigenous leaders in the black community, and blacks may well find themselves playing a greater role in the two-party system. □

South Africa . . .

(Continued from page 6)

Evolving Protest

The evolution of black protest in South Africa, then, shows us peaceful protest within the law, followed (after the institutionalization of apartheid in 1948) by nonviolent protest but now outside the law, followed (after the Sharpeville massacre in 1960) by armed struggle—in other words, protest no longer either legal or peaceful. Popular dissatisfaction, manifested in a spiraling pattern of strikes, marches, violent clashes with police, and the recently declared "state of emergency," makes it evident that the regime is in fundamental trouble: its legal right to rule is in dispute. And as the regime continues to lose legitimacy in the eyes of more and more blacks, the point of no return draws closer and closer—the point at which government concessions become irrelevant because the institutional mechanisms for redressing grievances have been rejected. (The recent series of attacks by blacks on black, coloured, and Indian so-called collaborators is but one reflection of many blacks' refusal to grant the white government the right to obedience.)

The idea of protracted guerrilla resistance against a regime that relies on conventional military forces brings to mind, again, the American experience in Vietnam. Even with the South African military forces increasing their emphasis on counterinsurgency training, the enemy they would confront would be the unnoticed waiter, busboy, mechanic, housekeeper, factory worker, or miner in whose hands a simple match in a city could become a more formidable weapon than a tank on a battlefield. If the future battlefield of the South African racial conflict were the country's cities, factories, farms, and mines, the economy would be at serious risk. It is true that military strength buttresses political power, but sustained political power is dependent upon a viable economy and social equilibrium. If the present situation were to evolve in such a way that the regime had to devote its full resources to suppressing black South Africans, then the economy would probably be devastated. One wonders whether, before then, the South African regime could bring itself to undertake substantive political reforms—and whether, if undertaken, such reforms would come soon enough to make any difference.□

FOCUS

Joint Center for Political Studies

1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED
Postmaster:
Form 3547 requested

PRICE $1.25

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

26063
SRI
ACQUISITIONS EDITOR
CONGRESSIONAL INFO SVC, INC.
4520 EAST-WEST HWY.
BETHESDA, MD 20814